<div align="center">**Remarks/Arguments**</div>

In the non-final Office Action dated January 7, 2010, it is noted that claims 1-3 and 7-9 are pending; that claims 1-3 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103; and that the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on September 29, 2009 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record in this application.

<div align="center">**Cited Art**</div>

The following references have been cited and applied as prior art in the present Office Action: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0002540 to Eerenberg (hereinafter referenced as "*Eerenberg*"); U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0002540 to Myles et al. (hereinafter referenced as "*Myles*"); U.S. Patent 7,120,092 to del Prado Pavon (hereinafter referenced as "*del Prado Pavon*"); and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0020226 to Mohindra (hereinafter referenced as "*Mohindra*").

Rejection Of Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Eerenberg in view of Myles. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 7, and 9 are independent claims. Claim 2 depends directly from claim 1. Claims 7 and 9, although different from claim 1, include limitations that are substantially similar to those discussed below from claim 1. As a result, the remarks below made with respect to claim 1 will be understood to pertain equally to claims 7 and 9 according to the particular interpretation of each claim, without further repetition herein.

Claim 1 recites for:

> *An apparatus for wirelessly transmitting and receiving digital video data, comprising:*
> *a means for receiving a time stamp indicating a time of a video transmission;*
> *a means for determining a relative time difference between the time stamp and a previous time stamp;*
> ***a means for communicating the relative time difference to a transmitter having as one feature of transmission a time base;***
> ***a means for the transmitter to adjust the time base according to the relative time difference.*** [Emphasis supplied].

As discussed in the response to the prior Office Action, it was argued that Eerenberg lacks any teaching, showing, or suggestion of the limitations emphasized in bold type above. In the

present Office Action, it is admitted by the examiner that Eerenberg does in fact lack any teaching of those limitations. In order to remedy the deficiencies in the teachings of Eerenberg, the teachings of Myles were combined with Eerenberg. Applicants submit that Myles fails to remedy the deficiencies in the teachings of Eerenberg, and that, as such, the combination of Myles and Eerenberg fail to teach, show, or suggest all the limitations of the independent claims.

Myles appears to teach a wireless LAN system, such as an IEEE 802.11 compliant system, in which clock synchronization is maintained by the MAC Timing Synchronization Function (TSF) through of the use of time stamps. *See Myles in at least the Abstract.* Whether at a station or an access point or any other type of network node, Myles receives and extracts synchronization information from a received packet. *Ibid and see also paragraph [0028].* This synchronization information is defined by Myles as a time stamp. *See Myles at paragraph [0036], for example.* In general, Myles appears to subtract a local time stamp from the received time stamp to compute an offset or adjustment factor. Once computed, the offset (or adjustment factor) is added to the local free-running clock to synthesize the synchronized TSF time. *See Myles at paragraphs [0011]-[0013], [0039]-[0046], and [0073], for example.* This newly synthesized synchronized TSF time is then inserted as the time stamp into the time stamp field of the beacon packet or into the time stamp field of any outgoing packet. *See Myles at [paragraphs 0046]-[0047].*

Myles does not teach, show, or suggest the limitation of "a means for communicating the relative time difference to a transmitter having as one feature of transmission a time base". As described in Myles and summarized herein above, the newly synchronized TSF time is inserted into outgoing packets as the time stamp. Myles does not transmit, in any manner, the **"relative time difference"** as defined in the claims. It should be recalled that the relative time difference is defined as being determined as "a relative time difference between the time stamp and a previous time stamp."

In the first instance, Myles does not compute any difference between a time stamp and a previous time stamp. But more importantly, Myles does not communicate a time difference at all. Instead, Myles broadcasts the resynchronized TSF time – as a time stamp – via beacon packets and the like. Even if the adjustment factor (offset) were assumed *arguendo* to be analogous to Applicants' "relative time difference," an assumption with which Applicants

neither agree nor acquiesce, it is clear that Myles lacks any teaching or suggestion that his adjustment factor be communicated to a transmitter. Myles adds the adjustment factor to the local free-running clock to generate a new time stamp, which is inserted into outgoing packets. That is, contrary to the limitations in the claims, Myles communicates the actual time and not the time difference in outgoing packets on his network. Thus, Myles does not cure the admitted defects in the teachings of Eerenberg and the combination of Myles with Eerenberg fails to teach all the limitations defined in the claims.

Since Myles transmits the resynchronized TSF time in the beacon packets, for example, any downstream adjustment of a time base – assuming for the sake of argument herein that Myles discloses such downstream adjustment – would be based on the received time stamp representing the synchronized TSF time. This result would be different from the claimed limitations because the claims require that the time base adjustment occurs according to the relative time difference, not according to the actual time as taught by Myles. Again, Myles does not cure the admitted defects in the teachings of Eerenberg and the combination of Myles with Eerenberg fails to teach all the limitations defined in the claims.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that Eerenberg does not teach, show, or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1, 7, and 9 and any claims dependent thereon.

In light of the remarks above, it is believed that claims 1-3, 7, and 9 would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art upon a reading of Myles and Eerenberg, either separately or in combination. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 7, and 9 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Eerenberg in view of Myles and del Prado Pavon and further in view of Mohindra. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 is dependent from independent claim 7 and includes all the limitations thereof. The allowability of claim 7 has been discussed above with respect to the Eerenberg and Myles references.

del Prado Pavon appears to be related to clock synchronization in wireless networks. But del Prado Pavon does not cure the defects in the teachings of Eerenberg because del Prado

Pavon does not communicate the relative time difference to a transmitter, del Prado Pavon does not transmit the relative time difference to one or more wireless station receivers, and del Prado Pavon does not adjust the time base in each of the one or more wireless station receivers according to the relative time difference, as defined in independent base claim 7.

Mohindra also fails to cure the deficiencies in Eerenberg and del Prado Pavon with respect to the independent base claim. Mohindra appears to be related to cancellation of DC offsets in a high speed communication system. Similar to del Prado Pavon, Mohindra does not communicate the relative time difference to a transmitter, Mohindra does not transmit the relative time difference to one or more wireless station receivers, and Mohindra does not adjust the time base in each of the one or more wireless station receivers, as defined in independent base claim 7.

In light of the remarks above and for all the reasons given with respect to the independent claims and particularly base independent claim 7 above, it is believed that claim 8 would not have been obvious to a person ordinarily skilled in the art upon a reading of Eerenberg, Myles, del Prado Pavon, and Mohindra, either separately or combination. Therefore it is submitted that claim 8 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
John Alan Gervais et al.

By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 3/31/10